June 2011

Lake States Fire Science Consortium

A JFSP KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE CONSORTIUM

Download to your desktop and read it onscreen for active web links

OUR MISSION

Accelerate the awareness, understanding, and adoption of wildland fire science information by federal, tribal, state, local, and private stakeholders in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin

CONTACT US

- Charles Goebel,
 Principal Investigator,
 goebel.11@osu.edu
- Robert Ziel, Program Coordinator, ziel.4@osu.edu

IN THIS ISSUE

- Growing Season
 Burns
- Fire on the Land
- Lake States Spotlight: University of Toronto & Canadian Forest Sv.
- Consortium
 Announcements
- Lake States Fuels
 Guide

ASSESSING RISK FOR WILDLAND FIRE DECISIONS

Interagency "Relative Risk Assessment" Process Suggests Relevant Issues

US Federal Fire Policy calls for risk management to be a key factor in all fire management decisions. Every significant decision in the wildland fire environment carries risk related to uncertainty about the outcome.

Wildfire threats vary in time and space. They can be mitigated, depending on the capabilities of resources that may be employed. But there is ample evidence that thoughtful evaluation of risk factors, identification of mitigation measures, and decisive action in response to questions that arise is important to management outcomes and community protection.

Consider the factors identified by the Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS) as part of their Relative Risk Assessment. The graphs found in the link to the right help the user integrate three important factors: values, hazard, and probability. **Values** that affect overall risk include ecological, social, and economic resources that can be lost or damaged. Smoke issues, loss of critical habitat, cultural and historic resources, timber values, and private property interests are but a few examples to be considered. The WFDSS assessment can help put their their value and importance in context.

Volume 2 Issue

Hazards include concerns about potential fire behavior, including how fast the fire may spread, the difficulty of work along the fireline, and the potential for the fuels of concern to produce unexpected or undesirable effects. This may also be where crew capabilities should be considered.

Probabilities often carry most of the uncertainty for any decision. Can the fire be contained to the defined area? Will the weather and fuel conditions change over time? Is it a spring or summer burn?

Though much of this is not new to any experienced manager, the way in which factors are organized, described, and integrated into an overall risk rating (low, mod, high) can inform which actions are worth the risk and what can be done to mitigate, or reduce, those risks.

Find details in doc found here:

http://www.nwcg.gov/general/memos/ nwcg-042a-2010.pdf

Growing Season Burns: Replies Highlight Questions & Answers

The article last month on "Fire Others reported their concerns Seasonality" brought a number for threatened populations and of responses from the their reproductive success as consortium community. variety of sources and responses expanding prescription windows themselves were positive in to new seasons. several ways.

First of all, without any formal with the National Park Service, way to gauge interest in these pointed out that internal studies monthly newsletters, the and gray literature may not be responses to that article showed widely available. that folks are reading. Thanks for suggested that summer burning that. feedback shows that the may produce more diversity of community is engaged and ready surface vegetation than to share their expertise and learn from others. The challenge will be to provide an effective vehicle for the conversation over time.

The web search conducted by Jessica Miesel pointed out that fire managers will need to do more than just "google" for answers. Greg Peterson and Greg Corace both pointed out research publications that the search missed, either because of age or keywords used by the author.

The important considerations when

Scott Weyenberg, Fire Ecologist He also But the substance of the in red pine of northern Minnesota comparable spring burns.

> Finally, here in early June, a large wildfire in jack pine and prescribed fires under oak suggest that fires after greenup are a fact of life here.

> Please continue to contact Robert Ziel at ziel.4@osu.edu if you would like to weigh in on when and how fire has a role as we share our understanding of fire seasonality in the Lake States. Thanks for the thoughts.

Fire on the Land **Native Peoples and Fire** History in the **Northern Rockies**

Nicholas Reo. Research Fellow at the University of Michigan, pointed out this website pulled together by the Salish and Kootenai in Montana.



(http://www.cskt.org/fire history.swf)

The site is provided as a resource for "anyone seeking information about the Indian use of fire and fire management on the Flathead Reservation." It includes a photo gallery, fire ecology information. training materials, and comparative looks at fire history and fire management today.



University of Toronto & Canadian Forest Service

With many lake states fire managers applying fire tools from both the US and Canada, this spotlight points to an important, new collaboration. University of Toronto and Canadian Forest Service are building a program in physical fire science based at the Faculty of Forestry at the University. The partnership's focus is on research in forest fire behavior and the development of enhancements to the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System (CFFDRS). This will involve both field research & model development in areas such as fuel moisture, fire occurrence & fire behavior. Mike Wotton (CFS) leads the work. <u>http://firelab.forestry.utoronto.ca/people/bmw.html</u>

http://www.firescience.gov LASH SCIENCE YOU CAN USE

Kidnie, S.M., Wotton, B.M., and 2 Underburning Publications: Droog, W.N.; Field Guide to Predicting Fire Behavior in Ontario's Tallgrass Prairie; 2010; Prescribed Burning Under University of Toronto; 65p.

This field guide was created to Research Paper NC-139 8p. address the need for a more accurate estimate of fire behavior in the tallgrass prairie of southern Actual fire behavior in Ontario. tallgrass prairies consistently exceeded Canadian Forest Fire Behaviour Prediction (FBP) predictions in the matted and standing grass fuel types (O1-a and O-1b) leading prescribed burn practitioners to under-predict expected fire behavior as well as limiting the conditions under Prescribed Burning in Red Pine which tall grass species can be and White Pine; The Forestry expected to burn. used in this guide can be used for all grass types in Ontario, however this assumption has not been tested.

This grass field guide and several supporting resources (including how-to references, worksheets, and other tools) can be found at the University of Toronto's Fire Management Systems Laboratory Page

http://firelab.forestry.utoronto.ca/

Alban, David; 1977; Influence on Soil Properties of Mature Red Pine: USFS

Prescribed fires in mature red pine stands reduced shrub competition and the organic layer thickness. the fires reduced nutrients in the forest floor, increased them in the mineral soil, but had no effect on overstory growth.

McRae, Douglas J., Lynham, **Timothy L. and Frech, Robert** J.; 1994; Understory The models Chronicle; 70:395-401

> Research in Canada, principally using the Canadian Forest Fire **Behavior Prediction (FBP)** System coupled with the **Canadian Forest Fire Weather** Index (FWI) System, allows forest managers to develop burning prescriptions that are safe and economical while meeting objectives for seedbed preparation, natural seeding and control of competing vegetation.

CONSORTIA **LAKE STATES** ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 35th Annual National **Indian Timber** Symposium, June 13-16 **Carlton**. Minnesota
- Northeast Forest Fire **Supervisors Meeting**, June 20-23, Traverse **City, Michigan**
- Barrens and Dry **Northern Forest Field** Trip, St. Ignace and Raco, Michigan, June 28-29. Contact ziel.4@osu.edu
- Michigan Prescribed Fire Annual Meeting, September 9-10, Hastings, Michigan
- Eastern Tallgrass Prairie & Oak Savanna (ETPOS) **Fire Science Consortium**

Lake States Advisory Committee

Marty Cassellius, Bureau of Indian Affairs, marty.cassellius@bia.gov

Theresa Gallagher, US Forest Service, tgallagher@fs.fed.us

Kathie Hansen, National Park Service, kathie_hansen@nps.gov

Dave Heaman, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, dave.heaman@ontario.ca

Andy Henriksen, USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service, andy.henriksen@mi.usda.gov

Tim Hepola, US Fish and Wildlife Service, tim_hepola@fws.gov

Doug Miedtke, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, doug.miedtke@state.mn.us

Russ Reisz, The Nature Conservancy, rreisz@tnc.org

Michele Richards, Military Facilities Environmental Resources michele.richards@us.army.mil

Mark Sargent, Wildlife Division MI Dept of Natural Resources <u>msargent@michigan.gov</u>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Can We Build a Lake States Fuels Guide?

Evaluating potential fire behavior is important to any risk assessment; for prescribed fire and wildfire. Many of the fire behavior modeling tools in common use today simplify description of the fuel characteristics that influence fire spread, intensity and severity.

There are 53 standard choices organized into 6 fuel groups designed to represent situations across the US system and 16 fuel types in 5 categories in the Canadian System. With both systems in use across the Lake States, there is a lot of knowledge and experience built into both prescribed burn and wildfire response plans.

While there is general consensus about how the most fire prone ecosystems are depicted, every region of the country faces the challenge of relating a variety of ecosystems across the landscape to fuel classifications that reflect the range of fire behavior. link



Fuel model guide to Alaska vegetation

This <u>Alaska guide</u> is an example of what can be produced to support users in a particular region. If you want to know more, contact <u>ziel.4@osu.edu</u>

Lake States Administrative Team

The Ohio State University

Charles Goebel, Associate Professor, Forest Ecosystems goebel.11@osu.edu 330-263-3789

David Hix, Associate Professor Silviculture <u>Hix.6@osu.edu</u>

Eric Toman, Assistant Professor Outreach Strategies toman.10@osu.edu

Robyn Wilson, Assistant Professor, Science & Risk Analysis wilson.1376@osu.edu

US Fish & Wildlife Service

Greg Corace,Forester, Seney National Wildlife Refuge greg_corace@fws.gov

Tim Hepola, Fire Management US FWS, Midwest Region tim_hepola@fws.gov

USFS Northern Research

Brian Palik, Research Ecologist Northern Research Station <u>bpalik@fs.fed.us</u>

Randy Kolka, Soil Scientist, Northern Research Station rkolka@fs.fed.us

Matt Bumgardner, Research Forest Product Technologist, Northern Research Station <u>mbumgardner@fs.fed.us</u>

Consortium Staff

Robert Ziel, Program Coordinator, <u>ziel.4@osu.edu</u> 906-553-4249

Jessica Miesel, Post-Doctoral Researcher, <u>miesel.1@osu.edu</u>